

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



A284.39  
77342

James



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE  
DAIRY DIVISION

December 28, 1953

To: All Market Administrators

From: H. L. Forest, Director

Subject: Changes in November Deliveries,  
Sales and Prices

Attached is a summary of reports from all Federal order markets covering producer deliveries of milk, fluid milk sales, and Class I and Blend prices and butterfat differentials for November 1953. This summary is based upon information submitted by market administrators in accordance with paragraph III A, "Advance Data from Pool Computations," of market administrator instruction No. 15 dated December 1, 1952.

In accordance with paragraph II B of market administrator instructions No. 14, dated October 9, 1951, the receipts and sales data contained herein are for administrative use only.

H. L. Forest

Attachments



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY  
1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY  
1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY  
1911

1911



Minimum Class I prices under Federal order markets, f.o.b. marketing area unless otherwise indicated, and handler butterfat differentials.

Market	Basic	Prices			Handler differentials		
		1953	1953	1952	1953	1953	1952
		Nov.	Oct.	Nov.	Nov.	Oct.	Nov.
	Percent	Dollars per 100 pounds			Cents 1/		
Boston, 201-210 mile zone	3.7	5.65	5.65	6.09	8.7	8.4	9.3
Cedar Rapids-Iowa City	3.5	4.320	4.274	5.202	9.4	9.3	9.9
Central West Texas	4.0	6.312	6.273	-	8.4	8.3	-
Chicago: Grade A 2/, 55-70 mile zone	3.5	4.262	4.224	5.152	7.9	8.1	8.3
Cincinnati	3.5	5.099	5.016	5.602	11.60	11.50	12.41
Cleveland	3.5 3/	5.264	5.170	5.772	10.37	10.18	11.36
Columbus	3.5 3/	4.705	4.862	5.232	10.09	10.53	10.93
Dayton-Springfield	3.5 3/	4.689	4.725	5.171	8.43	8.59	9.17
Detroit	3.5	4.643	4.830	5.302	7.5	7.5	7.5
Dubuque	3.5	4.362	4.324	5.252	9.43	9.26	9.94
Duluth-Superior	3.5	4.637	4.564	5.010	9.4	9.2	10.0
Fall River, within 100 miles	3.7	6.46	6.46	6.90	8.7	8.4	9.3
Fort Smith	4.0	5.632	5.573	6.744	8.4	8.3	8.9
Fort Wayne	4.0	5.319	5.362	5.002	8.6	8.8	9.0
Kansas City	3.8	5.116	5.299	5.799	8.76	8.60	9.23
Knoxville	4.0	5.347	5.261	5.857	8.8	8.6	9.2
Lima	3.5 3/	4.813	4.850	5.022	10.74	10.92	10.89
Louisville	3.8	4.980	5.020	5.811	8.3	8.4	8.6
Lowell-Lawrence, City plants	3.7	6.17	6.17	6.61	8.7	8.4	9.3
Memphis	4.0	5.88	5.48	6.28	8.42	8.26	8.88
Milwaukee	3.5	4.222	4.184	5.112	7.9	8.1	8.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul	3.5	4.403	4.368	4.972	8.52	8.60	8.81
Muskegon	3.5	4.533	4.570	-	7.5	7.5	-
Nashville	4.0	5.312	5.191	6.197	8.8	8.6	9.2
Neosho Valley, Kansas-Missouri	4.0	5.232	5.173	6.344	8.42	8.26	8.88
New Orleans, 61-70 mile zone	4.0 3/	6.630	6.630	6.780	11.40	11.40	11.65
New York, 201-210 mile zone 4/	3.5	5.94	5.71	5.85	4.0	4.0	4.0
North Texas	4.0	5.962	5.923	7.304	8.4	8.3	8.9
Oklahoma City	4.0	5.402	5.223	6.634	8.42	8.26	8.88
Omaha-Lincoln-Council Bluffs	3.8 3/	5.12	5.02	5.53	10.28	10.18	10.76
Paducah	4.0	5.541	5.599	5.947	7.9	8.1	8.3

Continued







Minimum Class I prices under Federal order markets, f.o.b. marketing area unless otherwise indicated, and handler butterfat differentials

Market	Basic	Prices		Handler differentials		Continued
		1953	1953	1953	1953	
	b. f.	Nov.	Oct.	Nov.	Oct.	
	Percent	Dollars per 100 pounds		Cents 1/		
Philadelphia	4.0	6.04	6.04	5.0	5.0	5.0
Puget Sound	4.0	5.385	5.321	8.6	8.5	9.8
Quad Cities	3.5	4.462	4.424	9.4	9.3	9.9
Rockford-Freeport 5/	3.5	4.282	4.244	8.8	8.7	9.3
St. Louis	3.5	5.240	4.850	8.1	7.9	8.9
San Antonio	4.0	6.93	6.97	8.4	8.3	8.9
Sioux City	3.5 3/	4.89	4.39	9.79	9.70	10.28
Sioux Falls-Mitchell	3.5 3/	4.74	4.64	10.29	10.19	10.77
South Bend-La Porte	3.5 3/	4.462	4.424	8.53	8.45	10.69
Springfield, Mass., City plants	3.7	6.17	6.17	8.7	8.4	9.3
Springfield, Missouri	3.5	4.97	4.58	8.1	7.9	8.9
Stark County, Ohio 6/	3.5 3/	5.44	5.48	12.15	12.33	-
Stark County, Ohio 7/	3.5 3/	5.19	5.23	11.59	11.77	-
Toledo	3.5	4.944	4.860	8.6	8.8	9.0
Topeka	3.8	5.116	5.299	8.2	8.20	9.70
Tri-State: Huntington Plants 8/	3.5	5.464	5.140	8.9	9.1	9.3
Tulsa-Muskogee	4.0	5.632	5.573	8.4	8.30	8.88
Wichita	3.8	5.282	5.225	7.9	8.1	8.3
Worcester, City plants	3.7	6.17	6.17	8.7	8.4	9.3

1/ For each one-tenth of one percent above or below basic butterfat test.

2/ Grade B price 10 cents less.

3/ This market is on a butterfat and skim milk basis; prices reported here computed for test shown.

4/ Class I-A prices.

5/ Rockford plants; Freeport plants 4 cents less.

6/ Plants holding Alliance, Canton or Massillon permits.

7/ Plants not holding permits.

8/ Prices at Gallipolis District Plant 10 cents less; Scioto District Plant 20 cents less, and Athens District Plant 30 cents less.

9/ Tulsa \$6.744; Muskogee \$6.344.

Compiled by the Program Analysis and Development Division, Dairy Branch, C.S.S., from reports of the market administrators.







Minimum uniform or weighted average of handlers' prices under Federal order markets  
f.o.b. marketing area unless otherwise indicated, and producer butterfat differentials.

Market	Basic	Prices		Producer differentials	
		1953	1952	1953	1952
	b. f.	Nov.	Oct.	Nov.	Oct.
	Percent	Dollars per 100 pounds		Cents 1/	
Boston, 201-210 mile zone	3.7	4.84	4.87	8.7	8.4
Cedar Rapids-Iowa City	3.5	3.98	4.05	7.9	8.1
Central West Texas	4.0	6.15	6.17	7.9	8.1
Chicago: Grade A 55-70 mile zone	3.5	3.95	4.02	7.9	8.1
Cincinnati: Grade A 2/	3.5	4.93	4.93	7.0	7.0
Cleveland	3.5	4.88	4.84	9.7	9.6
Columbus 3/	3.5	4.58	4.78	8.7	9.3
Dayton-Springfield 3/	3.5	4.97	5.09	7.9	8.1
Detroit 4/	3.5	4.33	4.49	7.5	7.5
Dubuque	3.5	3.98	4.05	7.94	8.08
Duluth-Superior 3/	3.5	4.69	4.63	8.4	8.2
Fall River, City plants	3.7	6.366*	6.350*	8.7	8.4
Fort Smith	4.0	5.21	5.33	7.9	8.1
Fort Wayne	4.0	4.80	4.86	7.6	7.7
Kansas City 3/	3.8	4.72	5.02	7.0	7.1
Knoxville	4.0	5.21	5.15	7.9	8.1
Lima	3.5	4.59	4.50	8.6	8.8
Louisville 3/	3.8	4.81	4.94	7.9	7.0
Lowell-Lawrence 5/	3.7	6.01	6.08	8.7	8.4
Memphis	4.0	5.80*	5.42*	7.0	7.0
Milwaukee	3.5	4.075*	4.109*	7.9	8.1
Minneapolis-St. Paul	3.5	4.187*	4.247*	8.2	8.3
Muskegon	3.5	4.23	4.26	7.5	7.5
Nashville	4.0	5.03	5.05	7.9	8.1
Necoho Valley, Kansas-Missouri	4.0	4.66	4.76	7.9	8.1
New Orleans, 61-70 mile zone	4.0	5.888*	6.111*	10.1	10.5
New York, 201-210 mile zone	3.5	4.91	4.51	5.8	5.6

Continued







Minimum uniform or weighted average of handlers' prices under Federal order markets f.o.b. marketing area unless otherwise indicated, and producer butterfat differentials.

Market	Basic b. f. test Percent	Prices		1952		1953		1954		Cents 1/
		Dollars per 100 pounds		Nov.		Oct.		Nov.		
		1953	1954	1953	1954	1953	1954	1953	1954	
North Texas	4.0	5.67	5.78	7.12	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	8.3	
Oklahoma City	4.0	4.91	4.91	6.35	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	
Omaha-Lincoln-Council Bluffs 3/	3.8	5.21	5.23	5.36	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	
Paducah	4.0	5.55	5.61	5.97	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.5	
Philadelphia	4.0	5.698*	5.696*	6.315*	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	
Puget Sound	4.0	4.96	4.930	5.83	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	9.5	
Quad Cities	3.5	4.03	4.07	5.12	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	9.6	
Rockford-Freepart	3.5	4.14	4.15	5.01	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	
St. Louis	3.5	5.10*	4.79*	6.09*	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	8.3	
San Antonio	4.0	6.85	6.91	7.35	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.6	
Sioux City 3/	3.5	4.29	4.27	4.79	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	
Sioux Falls-Mitchell 3/	3.5	4.94	4.89	5.00	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	
South Bend-La Porte	3.5	4.30	4.33	5.38	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	
Springfield, Massachusetts 5/	3.7	5.92	6.03	6.41	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	9.3	
Springfield, Missouri	3.5	4.43	4.30	5.64	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	8.3	
Stark County, Ohio 6/	3.5	5.28	5.30	5.64	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	-	
Stark County, Ohio 7/	3.5	5.07	5.09	-	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	-	
Toledo	3.5	4.831*	4.837*	5.455*	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.5	
Topeka 3/	3.5	4.79	5.24	5.72	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.3	
Tri-State: Huntington Plants	3.5	5.15	5.053	5.791	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	
Other Plants 8/	3.5	-	4.857	5.593	-	-	-	-	8.3	
Tulsa-Muskogee 9/	4.0	5.07	5.23	6.46	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	
Wichita 4/	3.8	4.746	4.941	5.622	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	
Worcester 5/	3.7	5.96	6.10	6.48	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	9.3	

See next page for footnotes

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud. The document also notes that records should be kept for a sufficient period of time to allow for a thorough review in the event of an audit.

2. The second part of the document describes the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed discussion of the different types of data that can be collected, such as financial data, operational data, and customer data. It also discusses the various techniques used to analyze this data, including statistical analysis, data mining, and machine learning.

3. The third part of the document discusses the importance of data security and privacy. It notes that data is a valuable asset and that it is essential to take steps to protect it from unauthorized access and use. The document also discusses the various laws and regulations that govern data security and privacy, and it provides guidance on how to comply with these requirements.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of data quality. It notes that data that is inaccurate or incomplete can lead to incorrect conclusions and decisions. The document also discusses the various techniques used to ensure data quality, such as data validation, data cleansing, and data auditing.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the importance of data governance. It notes that data governance is the process of managing the availability, usability, integrity, and security of the data used in an organization. The document also discusses the various components of data governance, such as data management, data security, and data privacy.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the importance of data literacy. It notes that data literacy is the ability to understand and use data effectively. The document also discusses the various ways in which data literacy can be developed, such as through training and education.

7. The seventh part of the document discusses the importance of data ethics. It notes that data ethics is the study of the moral principles that govern the use of data. The document also discusses the various ethical issues that arise in the use of data, such as privacy, security, and discrimination.

8. The eighth part of the document discusses the importance of data innovation. It notes that data innovation is the process of using data to create new products and services. The document also discusses the various ways in which data innovation can be fostered, such as through research and development.

9. The ninth part of the document discusses the importance of data collaboration. It notes that data collaboration is the process of sharing data between different organizations. The document also discusses the various benefits of data collaboration, such as improved efficiency and reduced costs.

10. The tenth part of the document discusses the importance of data transparency. It notes that data transparency is the process of making data accessible and understandable to all stakeholders. The document also discusses the various ways in which data transparency can be achieved, such as through open data and data sharing.

11. The eleventh part of the document discusses the importance of data security. It notes that data security is the process of protecting data from unauthorized access and use. The document also discusses the various techniques used to ensure data security, such as encryption, access control, and data backup.

12. The twelfth part of the document discusses the importance of data privacy. It notes that data privacy is the process of protecting data from unauthorized disclosure. The document also discusses the various laws and regulations that govern data privacy, and it provides guidance on how to comply with these requirements.

13. The thirteenth part of the document discusses the importance of data integrity. It notes that data integrity is the process of ensuring that data is accurate and complete. The document also discusses the various techniques used to ensure data integrity, such as data validation, data cleansing, and data auditing.

14. The fourteenth part of the document discusses the importance of data availability. It notes that data availability is the process of ensuring that data is accessible when it is needed. The document also discusses the various techniques used to ensure data availability, such as data backup, data recovery, and data replication.

15. The fifteenth part of the document discusses the importance of data usability. It notes that data usability is the process of ensuring that data is easy to use and understand. The document also discusses the various techniques used to ensure data usability, such as data visualization, data analysis, and data reporting.



Minimum uniform or weighted average of handlers' prices under Federal order markets  
f.o.b. marketing area unless otherwise indicated, and producer butterfat differentials.

Continued

\* Individual-handler pool. Weighted average of handlers' prices.

1/ For each one-tenth of one percent above or below basic butterfat test.

2/ Grade B price 40 cents less.

3/ Amount withheld for fall production payments:

Not included in uniform price:

	Nov. 1953	Oct. 1953	Nov. 1952
Columbus	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.55
Kansas City	.54	.555	.455
Louisville	.60	.60	.59
Sioux City	.17	.17	.18
Topeka	.515	.56	.405

Included in uniform price:

	Nov. 1953	Oct. 1953	Nov. 1952
Dayton-Springfield	\$ 0.443	\$ 0.44	\$ .
Duluth-Superior	.467	.451	.534
Omaha-Lincoln-C.B.	.402	.403	-
Sioux Falls-Mitchell	.411	.408	-

4/ Weighted average price:

	Nov. 1953	Base Price Oct. 1953	Nov. 1952	Excess Price Oct. 1953	Nov. 1952
Detroit	\$ 4.43	\$ 4.61	\$ 5.16	\$ 3.31	\$ 4.00
Wichita	5.16	5.22	5.91	3.89	4.77

5/ Farms located in nearby zones.

6/ Plants holding Alliance, Canton or Massillon permits.

7/ Plants not holding permits.

8/ Order amended Nov. 1, 1953 to include additional territory.

9/ Weighted average price of Tulsa and Muskogee.

Compiled by the Program Analysis and Development Division, Dairy Branch, C.S.S., from reports of the market administrators.





Daily producer deliveries of milk under Federal order markets, selected  
months (1,000 pounds)

Market	1953		1953		1952		Percentage change	
	Nov.	Oct.	Nov.	Oct.	Nov.	Month	Year	
Boston	3,718	3,924	:	:	3,412	- 5.2	+ 9.0	
Cedar Rapids-Iowa City	295	285	:	:	261	+ 3.3	+ 12.8	
Chicago	10,678	9,989	:	:	9,018	+ 6.9	+ 18.4	
Cincinnati	944	932	:	:	829*	+ 1.2	+ 13.8	
Cleveland	2,074	2,090	:	:	2,088	- 0.8	- 0.7	
Columbus	672	653	:	:	558	+ 2.9	+ 20.4	
Dayton-Springfield	711	693	:	:	629	+ 2.5	+ 13.0	
Detroit	4,200	4,184	:	:	3,822	+ 0.4	+ 9.9	
Dubuque	94	94	:	:	83	+ 0.2	+ 12.5	
Duluth-Superior	301	300	:	:	256	+ 0.2	+ 17.3	
Fall River	138	143	:	:	133	- 3.6	+ 3.2	
Fort Smith	90	86	:	:	86	+ 4.5	+ 5.0	
Fort Wayne	243	254	:	:	252	- 4.4	- 3.6	
Kansas City	1,070	1,004	:	:	837	+ 6.6	+ 27.8	
Knoxville	266	265	:	:	223	+ 0.2	+ 19.2	
Lima	103	100	:	:	81	+ 3.4	+ 27.9	
Louisville	696	671	:	:	599	+ 3.7	+ 16.2	
Lowell-Lawrence	379	384	:	:	353	- 1.3	+ 7.5	
Memphis	393	379	:	:	385	+ 3.8	+ 2.1	
Milwaukee	1,238	1,182	:	:	1,105*	+ 4.7	+ 12.0	
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,927	1,705	:	:	1,713	+ 13.0	+ 12.5	
Nashville	406	402	:	:	402	+ 0.9	+ 1.0	
Neosho Valley-Kans.Mo.	278	258	:	:	214	+ 8.0	+ 29.7	
New Orleans	686	693	:	:	631	- 1.1	+ 8.7	
North Texas	1,698	1,675	:	:	1,506*	+ 1.4	+ 12.7	
Oklahoma City	449	438	:	:	377	+ 2.5	+ 19.1	
Omaha-Lincoln-C.B.	701	676	:	:	537	+ 3.6	+ 30.5	
Paducah	77	77	:	:	64	+ 0.1	+ 19.3	
Philadelphia	2,808	2,906	:	:	2,738	- 3.4	+ 2.5	
Puget Sound	1,740	1,783	:	:	1,415	- 2.4	+ 23.0	
Quad Cities	475	468	:	:	372	+ 1.4	+ 27.5	
Rockford-Freeport	126	125	:	:	114	+ 0.7	+ 11.2	
St. Louis	1,325	1,255	:	:	1,137	+ 5.5	+ 16.5	
							Continued	

Continued





Daily producer deliveries of milk under Federal order markets, selected months (1,000 pounds)

Continued

Market	1953 Nov.	1953 Oct.	1952 Nov.	Percentage change from previous 1/ Month Year
San Antonio	368	376	326	- 2.2 : + 12.9
Sioux City	166	159	135	+ 4.1 : + 23.1
Sioux Falls-Mitchell	132	129	113	+ 2.7 : + 16.4
South Bend-La Porte	282	288	240	- 2.3 : + 17.1
Springfield, Mass.	482	490	462	- 1.5 : + 4.4
Springfield, Mo.	409	396	315	+ 3.1 : + 29.7
Toledo	548	518	445	+ 5.7 : + 23.2
Topeka	161	142	129	+ 13.2 : + 24.6
Tulsa-Muskogee	538	510	412	+ 5.6 : + 30.8
Wichita	422	399	337*	+ 5.7 : + 25.3
Worcester	293	290	289	+ 1.1 : + 1.6
Sub-total	44,798	43,772	39,436	+ 2.3 : + 13.6
New York	17,091	17,870	16,415	- 4.4 : + 4.1
Sub-total	61,889	61,642	55,851	+ 0.4 : + 10.8
Central West Texas	339	306	-	+ 11.0 : -
Muskegon	194	194	-	- 0.3 : -
Stark County, Ohio	341	341	-	+ 0.2 : -
Tri-State	404	394	2/	+ 2.4 : -
TOTAL	63,167	62,877	-	+ 0.5 : -

\* Revised

1/ Computed from unrounded figures.

2/ Marketing area increased; comparable data not available.

Computed by the Program Analysis and Development Division, Dairy Branch, C.S.S., from reports of the market administrators.





Daily Fluid Sales 1/ of milk under Federal order markets  
in area, selected months (1,000 pounds)

Market	1953 Nov.	1953 Oct.	1952 Nov.	Percentage change from previous 2/ Month Year
Boston	1,954	2,041	1,944*	- 4.3 : + 0.5
Cedar Rapids-Iowa City	138	142	126	- 2.8 : + 8.9
Chicago	5,339	5,732	5,216	- 6.9 : + 2.4
Cincinnati	748	797	706*	- 6.1 : + 5.9
Cleveland	1,577	1,641	1,610	- 3.9 : - 2.0
Columbus	533	565	473	- 5.7 : + 12.8
Dayton-Springfield	538	574	490	- 6.2 : + 9.7
Detroit	3,190	3,243	3,018	- 1.6 : + 5.7
Dubuque	57	68	59	- 16.0 : - 3.2
Duluth-Superior	180	184	175*	- 2.5 : + 2.8
Fall River	121	128	122*	- 5.3 : - 0.3
Fort Smith	51	52	61	- 2.2 : - 17.8
Fort Wayne	132	138	131	- 4.5 : + 0.0
Kansas City	727	776	680*	- 6.3 : + 6.9
Knoxville	261	267	231*	- 2.6 : + 13.0
Lima	89	95	91	- 5.8 : - 2.5
Louisville	552	575	525	- 4.1 : + 5.1
Lowell-Lawrence	268	278	267	- 3.5 : + 0.2
Memphis	384	405	379	- 5.1 : + 1.3
Milwaukee	990	1,018	926	- 2.7 : + 6.9
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,258	1,306	1,223	- 3.7 : + 2.8
Nashville	365	401	367	- 9.1 : - 0.6
Neosho Valley-Kans.-Mo.	189	197	189	- 3.8 : + 0.3
New Orleans	507	537	498	- 5.6 : + 1.9
North Texas	1,045	1,105	1,001	- 5.4 : + 4.4
Oklahoma City	342	366	344	- 6.4 : - 0.5
Omaha-Lincoln-C.B.	406	441	399	- 8.0 : + 1.6
Paducah	78	84	71	- 6.9 : + 10.5
Philadelphia	2,042	2,209	2,040	- 7.6 : + 0.1
Puget Sound	1,078	1,148	1,048	- 6.1 : + 2.8
Quad Cities	320	336	305	- 4.9 : + 4.9
Rockford-Freeport	97	103	90	- 5.6 : + 7.3

Continued



RECEIVED  
JAN 10 1964  
U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C.



Daily Fluid Sales 1/ of milk under Federal order markets,  
in area, selected months (1,000 pounds)

Market	Fluid Milk Sales		1952		Percentage change	
	1953	1953	Nov.	Oct.	Month	from previous 2/ Year
St. Louis	1,055	1,102	1,017		- 4.2	+ 3.8
San Antonio	352	373	362		- 5.7	- 2.9
Sioux City	83	88	81		- 5.1	+ 3.4
Sioux Falls-Mitchell	65	67	62		- 3.5	+ 4.7
South Bend-La Porte	242	260	243		- 6.7	- 0.1
Springfield, Mass.	394	418	388		- 5.8	+ 1.5
Springfield, Mo.	71	70	78		+ 1.2	- 9.5
Toledo	495	508	457		- 2.6	+ 8.3
Topeka	89	97	97		- 8.0	- 8.5
Tulsa-Muskogee	284	301	278		- 5.8	+ 2.3
Wichita	213	241	206		- 11.7	+ 3.4
Worcester	276	290	272		- 4.7	+ 1.5
Sub-total	29,173	30,763	28,344		- 5.2	+ 2.9
New York	8,778	7,782	8,708		+ 12.8	+ 0.8
Sub-total	37,951	38,545	37,053		- 1.5	+ 2.4
Central West Texas	268	247*	-		+ 8.5	-
Muskegon	155	164	-		- 5.7	-
Stark County, Ohio	261	277	-		- 5.9	-
Tri-State	378	380	3/		- 0.5	-
TOTAL	39,012	39,613	-		- 1.5	-

\* Revised.

1/ Includes fluid milk drinks.

2/ Computed from unrounded figures.

3/ Marketing area increased; comparable data not available.

Computed by the Program Analysis and Development Division, Dairy Branch, C.S.S.  
from reports of the market administrators.



